UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10/505,342 | 06/24/2005 | Takayuki Matsushima | 17155/003001 | 5910 |

22511 7590 04/28/2009

OSHA LIANG L.L.P.
TWO HOUSTON CENTER
909 FANNIN, SUITE 3500
HOUSTON, TX 77010

| EXAMINER | |
|---|---|
| GOFF II, JOEN L | |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 1791 | |

| NOTIFICATION DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|---|---|
| 04/28/2009 | ELECTRONIC |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docketing@oshaliang.com
buta@oshaliang.com

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicants argue, "However, JP '769 discloses merely bonding these two planar substrates together, not connecting first and second electrodes arranged on the first and second objects via electrically conductive particles. Further, also it is mentioned that there may be a preferred blending ratio between the principal ingredient (resin) and hardener (curing agent), there is no mention in JP '769 of the type of resin, curing agent, or type of curing reaction, which are each specified in claim 1 of the present application.".

JP '769 is exemplary of using a two pack adhesive in the art of producing an electrical device wherein the two packs/components are applied as two separate layers such that the adhesive has a long shelf life and is cured when desired by mixing the two layers. The absence of first and second electrodes or electrically conductive particles in the adhesive does not negate any of the teachings for which JP '769 is applied. JP '643 is relied upon to teach a specific two pack adhesive.

Applicants further argue, "However, JP '643 only discloses a general cationic curing system, and has no suggestion of how to apply the two-pack adhesive to objects for bonding. Specifically, there is no suggestion of whether the two solutions are applied to one surface or two surfaces, when the surface are adhered together, whether the silanol and aluminum chelate are applied to two surfaces and not reacted to generate cations until the surfaces are adhered together, etc, specifics of which are all recited in claim 1.".

JP '643 teaches a two pack adhesive wherein each of the two packs/components comprise the claimed materials including a first pack/component comprising the silane coupling agent and a second pack/component comprising the aluminum alcoholate. JP '769 is applied to specifically

show that in a two pack adhesive each of the two packs/components are applied as two separate layers.

Applicants further argue, "As demonstrated in examples 1-4 of the present application, the cured adhesive possesses high peel strength due to the separation of the first and second curing agents on the objects for bonding, whereas such high peel strength does not result in comparative examples 1 and 2, which combined the first and second curing agents in the adhesive layer, is low so as not to be able to bear practical use." and "Further, according to the present application, by generating cations by reaction of the silane coupling agent (as the main component of the first curing agent) with one or both of the aluminum chelate and aluminum alcoholate (as the main component of the second curing agent), the thermosetting resin is cationically polymerized at a lower temperature and for a shorter time than with a conventional adhesive.".

Applicants results are not persuasive. First, it is noted the claims are not commensurate in scope with the results. The results are only for aluminum chelate, and there are no results regarding aluminum alcoholate. Further, the claims do not require a low polymerization temperature or a short polymerization time. Second, it is not clear that the results demonstrate anything unexpected. The comparative examples only use 2 parts by weight of the second curing agent. There is no disclosure in examples 1-4 of the amount of the second curing agent such that there could be more or less second curing agent mixed with the adhesive thereby affecting the results. Additionally, the comparative examples are performed by forming the adhesive, applying the adhesive to a release film, drying the adhesive, and then using the adhesive for bonding. Obviously, because the adhesive in the comparative examples was not immediately

applied for bonding and was allowed to cure prior to be used for bonding the peel strength will be less as compared to examples 1-4 wherein the adhesive is not cured until it is used for bonding. This is the principle reason for using a two pack adhesive readily known to one of ordinary skill in the art as evidenced by both JP '769 and JP '643 such that the results then are what would be expected when comparing a two pack uncured adhesive at time of bonding to an at least partially cured adhesive at time of bonding.

Applicants further argue, "The Applicant respectfully notes that Matsushima is a § 102(e) reference and that both the present application and Matsushima were at the time the invention was made, owned by Sony Chemicals Corporation, now named Sony Chemical and Information Device Corporation.".

The statement is sufficient to overcome the rejection of Matsushima (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0151627) applied as a 102(e) reference. However, Matsushima has a publication date between applicants foreign priority date and effective US filing date. Applicants have not filed a certified English translation of priority document JP 2002-044232 to perfect the foreign priority such that Matsushima would be applicable under 102(a) until such translation is submitted to the office and demonstrates disclosure of the claimed subject matter. It is suggested applicants next communication with the Office include a certified English translation of the foreign priority document to preclude a 35 USC 103 rejection over Matsushima applied under 102(a).

/John L. Goff/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1791